

Those men express it and they have a right to. They have a duty to do it.

But it is also the President's duty to look and see what substance they have presented, how much they thought it out, what information they have, how much knowledge they have received from General Westmoreland or Ambassador Bunker, whoever it is; how familiar they are with what is going on; and whether you really think you ought to follow their judgment or follow the judgment of the other people.

I do that every day. Some days I have to say to our people: "Let us try this plan that Senator X has suggested." And we do.

We are doing that with the United Nations resolution. We have tried several times to get the United Nations to play a part in trying to bring peace in Vietnam.

The Senate thinks that this is the way to do it. More than 50 of them have signed a resolution.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee had a big day yesterday. They reported two resolutions in one day.

I have my views. I have my views about really what those resolutions will achieve. But I also have an obligation to seriously and carefully consider the judgments of the other Branch of the Government. And we are going to do it.

Even though we may have some doubts about what will be accomplished, that they think may be accomplished, if it is a close question we will bend to try to meet their views because we think that is important.

We have already tried the United Nations before, but we may try it again because they have hopes and they believe that this is the answer. We will do everything that we can to make it the answer.

I don't want to hurt its chances by giving any predictions at this moment.

We will consider the views that everyone suggests.

The Press. Thank you, Mr. President.

(Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. PEPPER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

A-PLUS FOR THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. YOUNG (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, at his televised press conference, President Johnson flashed the old form that has made him one of the most effective and persuasive officials in Washington for more than 30 years.

What the entire Nation saw was not just Lyndon Johnson at his best. It was Lyndon Johnson—period: compelling, humorous, believable, animated, articulate, and, above all, totally committed to the cause of progress at home and peace abroad.

To those of us who have had the privilege of working with President Johnson through the years, this side of his personality was nothing new. But to millions of others, who know him only through their television receivers, this "break-through in communication" must have been startling indeed.

It is not easy for a man to adapt himself to the demands of television. But last week, Lyndon Johnson bridged the gap—not as an actor, but as himself.

It was an A-plus performance, and I hope we will be treated to many repeats in the months ahead.

ABM ANOTHER WHACK FOR NATO

(Mr. MONAGAN (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, as one who strongly believes in the value of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its role in the security of the free world, I find it disturbing to consider the effects of a recent decision by the United States. This is the way in which we have planned and announced a "thin" antiballistic missile system. By failing to consult with other members of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group before announcing the decision to develop an ABM system, we have seriously shaken the confidence of our allies—and this at a time when the recent withdrawal of France from NATO's military arm and a euphoria about the extent of the détente with the East has had seriously disturbing effects on the operations and the outlook of the alliance.

On this topic I commend to my colleagues' attention an appraisal which appeared in the New York Times on November 12, 1967, entitled "Europe Worries About 'Fortress America'":

EUROPE WORRIES ABOUT "FORTRESS AMERICA"

Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara's statement that the Soviet Union may be developing a fractional orbital bombardment system has fed European fears about the American state of mind on the nuclear arms race.

The concern has been evident in London since the great McNamara démarche of last Sept. 18—his speech in San Francisco announcing that the United States would build a "light" antiballistic missile (ABM) system to defend against a possible nuclear attack by Communist China.

As it happened, Mr. McNamara had assured the other members of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group in Washington last April that he would keep the European allies completely informed on American ABM plans. The allies were delighted and reassured by this pledge.

SHOCK TO ALLIES

The shock was all the worse, then, when the news of the American decision burst upon the allies just before the next meeting of the planning group, in Ankara. The lack of consultation made everyone, as one mild-spoken source put it, "very unhappy."

The major fear is that the move represents a step toward a "Fortress America" philosophy—the belief that the United States can find sanctuary behind an ABM Maginot Line. Mr. McNamara's friends in London and Bonn and elsewhere in Europe have not the slightest idea that he has such thoughts, but the decision inevitably has revived that kind of worry about American purposes.

The security of Western Europe and the Atlantic Alliance has rested for two decades on one pillar: the American nuclear deterrent. The total commitment of the United States to regard any Soviet attack on her

allies as one on herself, and to reply against Russia is at the heart of the alliance.

Anything that may make Americans feel more protected against nuclear assault on their own territory may logically be seen as threatening the commitment to Europe. The nightmare of any good ally in Europe is that, some day, an American Government will lose interest in Europe and decide its strategic defenses can begin in the Atlantic.

In Germany there is a general worry that the cost of the ABM system—\$5-billion by Mr. McNamara's estimate, but probably pointing upward from there—may tend to produce cuts elsewhere, perhaps in American soldiers on the ground in Germany.

The decision is also regretted because of the pressure it produces for Europe to have its own ABM system. The European military experts who have been studying the matter—and a study had to be undertaken after the American move—have all reported so far that such a continental system would make no sense.

One reason is that, according to the experts, no number of ABM's could prevent millions of casualties in Europe from a major nuclear attack.

A second reason is that any ABM system would be an overpowering financial burden on the already overstrained European defense budgets. Moreover, if NATO were seriously to go for a defensive strategy instead of the deterrent, it should logically spend billions on civil defense and on conventional defenses against low-flying planes. That kind of money for defense is not politically imaginable.

Third, the decision on whether to fire off an ABM would have to be taken in seconds. So, in a meaningful system, the power to let the nuclear warheads go would have to be delegated to military commanders. Yet, such delegation raises grave political problems whose solution cannot be envisaged.

POLITICALLY IMPOSSIBLE

What is significant is that, despite all those powerful negatives, no major European power has formally foresworn the idea of an ABM system. The feeling at the Ankara meetings in September was that it was not politically possible to do so.

What his European audience liked about Mr. McNamara's San Francisco speech was his warning against "the mad momentum intrinsic to the development of all new nuclear weaponry." There was agreement, too, when he said, "The danger in deploying this relatively light and reliable Chinese-oriented ABM system is going to be that pressures will develop to expand it into a heavy Soviet-oriented ABM system."

What thoughtful persons in Europe, as in the United States, would question is whether Mr. McNamara can appease the forces favoring all-out ABM spending by his grudging acceptance of a "light" anti-Chinese system. The Congressional reaction to his disclosure and attempted playing-down of the fractional orbital weapon increases those doubts.

The gloomier critics see, therefore, terrible possibilities of another major spiral in the arms race, with the Soviet Union reacting to American reactions, with the hope of nuclear arms limitation wanting, with vast resources once again being withheld from civil needs.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON TEACHES LESSON OF RESPONSIBILITY

(Mr. JOHNSON of California (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Friday, morning at his press conference, President Johnson clearly demonstrated his talents as a teacher.

He taught all of us a valuable lesson about the difference between responsibility and irresponsibility in the exercise of our basic right of free speech when he said:

There is a difference between constructive dissent and storm-trooper bullying, howling, and taking the law into their own hands.

Further along in the press conference, the President went on to say:

There is a great deal of difference, as I said a moment ago, between criticism, indifference, and responsible dissent—all of which we insist on and all of which we protect—and storm-trooper bullying, throwing yourself down in the road, smashing windows, rowdiness, and every time a person attempts to speak to try to drown him out.

We believe very strongly in preserving the right to differ in this country, and the right to dissent.

All of us should follow the President's leadership, whether we agree or disagree on a particular matter of policy, in getting the word to the people back home that Americans must once again return to their traditional ways of criticizing constructively.

We must bring to a halt here and now the disruptive street brawling tactics of a well-organized minority which seeks to stifle the right that all of us enjoy, the right to free speech.

We do not demand that members of this rowdy minority listen to their fellow citizens, but we do demand that they do nothing to interfere with the right of their fellow citizens to speak out.

We all owe Lyndon Johnson a debt for issuing a call for the return to the traditional American way of insuring fair play in the marketplace of ideas.

PRAISE FOR THE PRESIDENT'S PRESS CONFERENCE

(Mr. PICKLE (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Friday, November 17, 1967, was a great day for all Americans. President Johnson on that day spoke directly to the hearts and minds of the American people through his press conference, and the people all over the country have responded.

Phone calls, letters, and telegrams all evidence the responsive chord struck by President Lyndon Johnson when he spoke directly to the people.

Some journalists and the commentators have hailed the "new" Lyndon Baines Johnson. But you and I know that the man who spoke for all of us on Friday was not a new Lyndon Johnson. For 30 years the people of central Texas, particularly the 10th District, which he represented in Congress so long, knew the Lyndon Johnson who is best when he is in a smaller group or when he can talk "heart to heart" with

his constituents. The people saw and heard the real Lyndon Johnson exercising his leadership so that this Nation may go forward in strength to insure lasting peace and prosperity at home and abroad.

All of us can draw inspiration from many of the wise things said by the President. I for one approach the future with renewed confidence that the people of this country will continue to recognize that America's future and security are insured as long as Lyndon Johnson is President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Dallas Morning News published an editorial Saturday morning following this news interview, and I am happy to include it, as follows:

LOUD AND CLEAR

In one of the most animated and spontaneously eloquent press conferences of his career, President Johnson yesterday addressed himself to the nation's people and his own critics, including "all the preachers across the country."

"I thought I'd explained the reasons for the war," he said, but just in case someone had not heard them before, he explained them again. They are, first, "to protect the security of the United States," and, second, "to resist aggression."

"When we're party to a treaty that says we'll do it (resist aggression) then we'll carry it out."

Progress toward our goals in that war is encouraging and "we're pleased with that progress," he said. Though there are no sudden and decisive victories that allow the U.S. to get it over quickly, the President pointed to the positive achievements of the U.S. and its allies in both the military and nation-building aspects of the war.

Despite the progress, however, there has been growing dissent, criticism and dissatisfaction and the President took a philosophical view of this. Noting the problems of past wartime presidents, he declared that "No one likes war. All people love peace. But you can't have freedom without defending it."

He hotly denied any implication that he has tried to squash dissent. Fact is, he quipped, "If I've done a good job of anything since I've been President, it's to assure that there are plenty of dissenters."

The President made a distinction on several occasions between honest, constructive dissent "and stormtrooper bullying, howling, and taking the law into your own hands."

He sternly reproached those who resort to such tactics as "throwing yourself down in the road, and smashing windows and shouting down people when they try to speak."

"Let's realize we're in a war," he said. "We have 500,000 of our boys risking their lives in it."

He urged critics to think before they speak whether what they are going to say is likely to contribute to a solution of the problems the nation faces.

"Let's ask ourselves what we can do to help," suggested the President. It does not seem too much to ask of the people of a nation fighting a war.

This was a good, tough, straight-from-the-shoulder discussion of the national issues by the President. The press conference was free of the public-relations glossiness and oratorical gimcrackery of past occasions. The President may not have sounded like the kindly old shepherd of consensus, but he left no doubts as to his meaning. He came across loud and clear with some statements of national resolution that are long overdue.

Let him continue in this vein and the credibility gap that has plagued him will not be long for this world.

A GREAT RECEPTION FOR A GREAT PRESIDENTIAL PERFORMANCE

(Mr. HANLEY (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the real Lyndon B. Johnson stood up. Americans watching on television saw the President as he really is—sincere, articulate, persuasive, and forceful in his convictions.

As the Washington Evening Star notes:

All this came through to the TV viewer with striking forcefulness. It was a memorable performance.

Indeed, it was. And I, for one, believe that if President Johnson continues to address the American people the way he did on Friday, he will win reelection by an even greater margin than he did in 1964.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the Record the excellent editorial from the Washington Evening Star which is appropriately entitled "The President at His Best":

THE PRESIDENT AT HIS BEST

It is difficult to recall any White House news conference more impressive than the one staged yesterday by President Johnson. The TV cameras covered him from better angles than usual, and a "necklace" microphone let him move about freely, away from the pulpit-like podium. He spoke without notes, in good, strong, simple English.

His defense of American policy in Vietnam was masterful and eloquent. His recollection of the faultfinding, backbiting and censorious attacks suffered by many of his predecessors was instructive. So was his own Lincolnian comment on the White House: "The important thing for every man who occupies this place is to . . . try to find out what is right and then do it without regard to polls and criticisms."

Polls, Mr. Johnson made clear, do not make him feel faint of heart, for they merely reflect public moods that are as fickle as the wind. Ask Harry Truman. As for the critics, the President was relaxed, good-tempered, but devastating in what he had to say in distinguishing between the honest ones and those who claim to be peace demonstrators but whose outrageous conduct—like that displayed against Secretary Rusk the other night—amounts to something more like hoodlumism. It is "stormtrooper bullying and howling and taking the law into their own hands"—an "extremely dangerous" sort of thing that is "not very helpful to the men who are fighting the war for us."

All this came through to the TV viewer with striking forcefulness. It was a memorable performance. Some people keep saying that the President has a serious communication problem with the general public, and especially with the so-called liberal community. If so, he should be pretty well able to solve it by resorting more often to the kind of discourse he has just given.

THE REAL PRESIDENT JOHNSON

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, our President has been the target lately of